

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-43 were pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 11 is being amended and claims 38-40 are being cancelled, to advance the prosecution of the application. The abstract is being amended as required. No new matter is involved.

In paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the abstract is objected to as being excessively long. In response, Applicant is amending the abstract to reduce the length thereof below the 150 word maximum.

In paragraph 2 which begins on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 11 is objected to because the recitation "said second tape" in lines 10 and 11 thereof is said to be without sufficient antecedent basis. In response, Applicant is amending claim 11 in order to recite "a second tape" in lines 10 and 11 thereof. As so amended, claim 11 should now be clear and definite.

In paragraph 3 which begins on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Document number 09-039347 of Furuya et al. In paragraph 4 which begins on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 14-19 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,383,733 to Zinsmeyer et al. Claims 27-31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al. in view of Japanese Patent Document number 2000006501 to Mochinaga. Claims 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zinsmeyer et al. in view of Mochinaga. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,533,818 to Bahrabadi. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al. and Zinsmeyer et al., and

further in view of Bahrabadi. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuya et al. and Mochinaga and further in view of Bahrabadi.

Claims 38-40 are being cancelled, thereby obviating the rejection thereof on the combination of Zinsmeyer and Mochinaga. With respect to the remaining rejections on art, such rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action describes Furuya et al. as anticipating all of the recitations thereof. Furuya et al. is a publicly laid-open application of the same assignee to which the present application is assigned. Such application does not disclose the feature of claim 1 of "to-be-detected image clicking means...such that said to-be-detected image can be detected by predetermined detecting means".

In contrast, what is disclosed in Furuya et al. corresponds to the "physical properties" as explained with reference to the prior art (see page 1, line 4 from the bottom of the specification as originally filed). Mainly, such application discloses "...specify now the specification of the tape for printing...from the number of the specification displays 6 printed black, and the combination of a location by..." (see page 4 of 8, line 7 to 10 from the bottom). Consequently, such reference does not relate to "desired configuration information" (= information in which the user can set as he desires; see page 1, last three lines - page 2, line 2 of the present application). Consequently, claim 1 clearly distinguishes patentably over the reference.

The same applies to claims 2-13 which are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1 and which therefore contain all of the limitations thereof.

Claim 14 has been rejected on the combination of Furuya et al. and Zinsmeyer et al. In this connection, the Examiner admits the absence of any disclosure in Furuya et al. of the features set forth in the latter half of claim 14.

Appl. No. 09/826,408  
Amdt. Dated January 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0105  
Customer No.: 26021

The Office Action asserts that the feature is disclosed in Zinsmeyer et al. However, Zinsmeyer et al. fails to disclose the feature of claim 14 of "printing a to-be-detected image representative of said desired configuration information on said first tape..." (judging from the disclosure in column 17, at about line 38). Such being the case, even if an attempt is made to combine the two references, claim 14 patentably distinguishes thereover.

Claims 15-26 depend directly or indirectly from and contain all of the limitations of claim 14 so as to also distinguish patentably over the art.

Regarding claim 27 which defines a tape cartridge bearing a to-be-detected image which is a character string information image that represents character string information for printing an image of a fixed-formed character string having at least one character arranged thereon, the attempted combination of Mochinaga with Furuya et al. does not render this obvious, so that such claim is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

Claims 28-37 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 27 and contain all of the limitations thereof so that such claims are also submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

With respect to the rejection of claims 5, 20 and 32 on various combinations of the references, the attempted addition of Bahrabadi, Zinsmeyer et al. and Mochinaga to Furuya et al. does not cure the basic deficiencies of Furuya et al., so that such claims are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the art.

In conclusion, claims 1-37 and 41-43 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los

Appl. No. 09/826,408  
Amdt. Dated January 14, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 4, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0105  
Customer No.: 26021


Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6700 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: January 14, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
John P. Scherlacher  
Registration No. 23,009  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701